## Supplementary Table 1 GRADE A) Re-intubation rate; B) Rate of escalation of respiratory support

## А.

Quality assessment								No of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Reinbutation	Control	Relative (95% Cl)	e Absolute		Importance
Reintubat	ion-RCT											
6	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	8/373	23/372	RR 0.39	38 fewer per 1000 (from	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	CRITICAL
	trials	risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		(2.1%)	(6.2%)	(0.17 to 0.87)	8 fewer to 51 fewer)	HIGH	
										35 fewer per 1000 (from		
								5.7%		7 fewer to 47 fewer)		
Case control studies												
2	observational	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	10/89	38/183	OR 0.32	130 fewer per 1000	⊕000	CRITICAL
	studies		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		(11.2%)	(20.8%)	(0.15 to 0.71)	(from 51 fewer to 170	VERY	
										fewer)	LOW	
										169 fewer per 1000		
								28%		(from 64 fewer to 225		
										fewer)		
Reintubat	ion- Cohort stu	dy										
1	observational	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	1/45	7/45	OR 0.12	134 fewer per 1000	⊕⊕00	CRITICAL
	studies	risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		(2.2%)	(15.6%)	(0.01 to 1.05)	(from 154 fewer to 7	LOW	
										more)		
								15 60/		134 fewer per 1000		
								15.0%		(from 154 fewer to 7		

										more)		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------	--	--

<sup>1</sup> High flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy or conventional oxygen therapy based on the individual attending's discretion

_
_

Quality assessment								No of patients		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Escalation of respiratory support	Control	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute	Quality I	Importance
Escalatio	Escalation of respiratory support-RCT											
7	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias <sup>2</sup>	42/481 (8.7%)	78/484 (16.1%)	RR 0.54 (0.38 to 0.77)	74 fewer per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 100 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
								13.5%		62 fewer per 1000 (from 31 fewer to 84 fewer)		
Escalatio	n of respiratory	support-cas	se control studies	5		1		1		1		1
2	observational studies <sup>3</sup>	serious <sup>4</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	10 cases 38 c	28%	OR 0.32 (0.15 to 0.71)	- 130 fewer per 1000 (from 51 fewer to 170 fewer) 169 fewer per 1000 (from 64 fewer to 225 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Escalatio	n of respiratory	support- Co	ohort studies									
1	observational studies	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1/45 (2.2%)	7/45 (15.6%)	OR 0.12 (0.01 to	134 fewer per 1000 (from 154 fewer to 7	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

					1.05)	more)	
						134 fewer per 1000	
				15.6%		(from 154 fewer to 7	
						more)	

<sup>1</sup> I2=64%, the heterogeneity was high

<sup>2</sup> Funnel plots suggest that there may be publication bias in Futier's research

<sup>3</sup> case-control

<sup>4</sup> High flow nasal cannula oxygen therapy or conventional oxygen therapy based on the individual attending's discretion